DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 382 HE 021 073

AUTHOR Craddick, Jan
TITLE Developing the Senior Seminar.
PUB DATE May 87
NOTE 58p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bachelors Degrees; *College Seniors; *Course Descriptions; Course Evaluation; *Curriculum Development; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; Interdisciplinary Approach; *Learning Experience; *Liberal Arts; Rating Scales; *Seminars; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Student Experience
IDENTIFIERS *Sheldon Jackson College AK

ABSTRACT

The Senior Seminar (Humanities 497) at Sheldon Jackson College, Alaska, is described. The focus of this interdisciplinary, division-taught course, is to develop a syllabus for the course using the product development guidelines of the Nova University (Florida) course, "Curriculum and Program Planning." The Senior Seminar is a requirement for a new bachelor of arts degree in the liberal arts. Students taking the seminar define and evaluate the college learning experiences that have contributed to their world view. Course development was done in several stages: faculty interviews, review of courses at other colleges, student evaluations, and the final draft of the syllabus. Review of senior seminars at other colleges identified learning resources, teaching strategies, and evaluation methods. Resources include the classics as basic texts and contemporary works as supplemental texts. The syllabus has been recommended to liberal arts division faculty to be used in implementing the course in spring 1989. Appendices include: liberal arts division long-range plan for 1986-1989, a course outline, instructor and course evaluation forms, and the Senior Seminar syllabus and reading list. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290382

DEVELOPING THE SENIOR SEMINAR

Seminar: Curriculum and Program Planning

by

Jan Craddick, M.A.

Sheldon Jackson College

Cluster Coordinator: F. Marvin Hole, Ed.D.

Cluster: Anchorage

A Practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

Nova University

May 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jan Craddick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 021 073

ABSTRACT

From June 1985 to March 1986, assisted by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, liberal arts faculty at Sheldon Jackson College worked on the development of an upper division liberal arts program. By March the faculty had completed a Bachelor of Arts degree in the Liberal Arts. Following approval by the full faculty and the Board of Trustees, the degree was submitted to the Northwest Accrediting Association and approved for implementation in Fall 1987.

The capstone course for the degree is an inter-disciplinary, division taught course, Humanities 497, the Senior Seminar. The focus of the practicum has been to develop a syllabus for the course using the product development guidelines of the Nova course, Curriculum and Program Planning.

A review was undertaken of senior seminars at other colleges and universities with a special focus on learning resources, teaching strategies, and evaluation. On the basis of the review, the syllabus has been developed. Resources include the classics as basic texts and contemporary works as supplemental texts. The syllabus has been recommended to division faculty to be used in implementing the course in Spring 1989.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT ii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

    Sheldon Jackson College 1

    The Liberal Arts Degree 1

    The Senior Seminar 4

2. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE 5

    Curriculum 5

    Planning 10

3. PROCEDURES 12

    Sources of Data 12

        Faculty Interviews 13

        Review of Courses 13

    Student Evaluations 14

    The Final Draft 15

4. FINDINGS AND RESULTS 16

    Learning Resources 16

    Teaching Strategies 18

    Course Requirements 21

    Evaluation 23

5. DISCUSSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 25

Course Design 25
Course Delivery 26
Student Requirements 26
Evaluation 27
Time Line 28
Continuing Development 28
REFERENCES 29
APPENDIXES
A. Long Range Plan 31
B. Outline, Senior Seminar 32
C. Evaluation Forms 33
D. Syllabus, Senior Seminar 34

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Sheldon Jackson College

Sheldon Jackson College is a small (FTE 316) liberal arts college located in Sitka, Alaska. Its educational goal is to provide a college education for all Alaskans, and its historic mission has been to serve Alaska Native (Indian, Aleut, and Eskimo) students. Sheldon Jackson College has served the Native population of the state for over 100 years and offered college level courses since 1942. The institution currently offers B.A. and B.S. degrees in Aquatic Resources, Business Administration, Elementary Education, and Natural Resource Development, and, in Fall 1987, will implement a Bachelor's degree in Liberal Arts.

The Liberal Arts Degree

From June 1985 to March 1986, assisted by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, liberal arts faculty at Sheldon Jackson College worked on development of an upper division liberal arts program. The goal of the NEH project was to develop Humanities curricula for the education and science degree students, but the project accomplished far more. By March 1986, liberal arts faculty

had completed a Long Range Plan (Appendix A) which included a Bachelor of Arts degree in the Liberal Arts with three possible emphasis areas: Humanities, Social Sciences, and General Studies. The degree was approved by the faculty in April and by the Board of Trustees in May, 1986. The proposed degree was submitted to the Northwest Accrediting Association and has been approved for implementation in Fall 1987.

Included in the degree requirements are a number of interdisciplinary courses:

1. Humanities 121 and 122 are team-taught courses designed to give students an early experience in the concepts the division feels are essential to a liberal arts education; Humanities 121 focuses on the nature of thought, God, nature and humankind; 122 on a properly ordered society, history, and aesthetics;

2. Humanities 222, designed to be taught by a science-arts team, addresses the nature of creativity, discusses creativity in relation to themes, and involves the students in creative endeavors leading to publication, exhibition or performance;

3. Humanities 320 and 321 are taught by a literature-arts team and approach the arts and humanities in a chronological fashion with emphasis on Western culture;

4. Humanities 497, the Senior Seminar, designed to be led by a division team, asks students to reflect upon, define and evaluate the college learning experiences which have contributed to the development of their world view.

The first five courses have been developed,

implemented, evaluated and revised in varying degrees over the last six years. The first interdisciplinary Humanities course sequence was Humanities 220-221, Humanities through the Arts, taught initially in 1980-81. Humanities 121-122, a revision of the sophmore sequence, is being offered at the freshman level for the first time this year. Humanities 222 was taught for the first time during the 1985-86 school year as an elective. It was added to the Liberal Arts sequence this year. Humanities 320-321 began its history as an adjunct to Humanities 220-221 and was designed to meet the needs of students in the Teacher Education program. Now it must serve students majoring in Liberal Arts as well as students from the four other Bachelor's degree programs. It has been revised, not so much in content as in delivery, to challenge those students.

Since all the above courses are interdisciplinary and were designed to be team-taught, a major problem in their development has been co-ordination of delivery. The small size of the school has made true team-teaching impossible. The alternative has been a term teaching approach. A key to effective use of this approach is planning. Such planning, then, was essential to the development of the sixth course in the sequence, Humanities 497, the Senior Seminar.

The Senior Seminar

An outline for the senior seminar (Appendix B) was developed by the division during the planning period mentioned above. Although the course is not scheduled to be taught until the 1988-89 school year, the growing pains of the other interdisciplinary courses made it obvious that a suitable way to develop an interdisciplinary course would be to develop a syllabus for the course using the product development guidelines of the Nova course in Curriculum Program and Planning. The syllabus would have to include course goals, behavioral objectives, course requirements, criteria for grading, teaching strategies and procedures, learning activities, learning resources, and student evaluation methods, as well as a plan for course evaluation and revision. Program guidelines would provide one set of criteria. Other criteria would be suggested by the curriculum of other colleges and universities providing similar courses.

Chapter 2

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Curriculum

In developing the long-range plan, it was essential for the Liberal Arts Division to explore the need for the degree program. They did this by citing such varied sources as the State of Alaska Department of Education, the Covenant between Sheldon Jackson College and the Synod of Alaska-Northwest of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., and Recommendations of the Rockefeller Commission on the Humanities.

In developing the senior seminar, the above sources were reviewed along with additional material related to the importance of liberal arts to the curriculum. Sheldon Jackson College Distinguished Faculty Scholar and Author James Michener (1984), explaining his $2 million gift to Swarthmore College, put it most ably: "I want to remind young people that the liberal arts are still the traditional highway to great thinking and the organization of life."

Montaigne (in Bennett, 1984) wrote: "A pupil should be taught what it means to know something, and what it means not to know it: what should be the design and end of study; what valor, temperence, and justice are; the difference

between ambition and greed, loyalty and servitude, liberty and license; and the marks of true and solid contentment."

Spitzberg (1986) described the value of the liberal arts as providing the context for continued learning. He noted: "If we as a society are to meet the awesome challenges of a world of star wars and international economic competition while strengthening our free society, we must make sure that we continue to learn how to learn. The liberal arts are both the beginning and the continuation of this enterprise."

He further observed: "Most new jobs - about 80% - are created by small companies, those which hire liberal arts graduates and put a premium on the ability to meet many challenges through flexibility and creativity...because the best liberal arts education prepares one to learn..."

Reading next focused on what approaches other institutions were making to the liberal arts and, specifically, to the senior seminar. Suzza (1982) described the senior course at Ripon College as one which encouraged the synthesis of content in previous courses, which helped serve as a review and filled in any gaps in the progress of individuals. The senior seminar was designed to provide for the growth and development of the individual, the development of human understanding, and the

capacity for responsible inquiry.

Bundy (1979) described the program at Dominican College in which diverse disciplines or great figures were clustered together around a central topic to form a colloquium. The intention of the program was to immerse both students and faculty in an educational experience of man as a questioning, valuing, feeling human being. The broad overall goal was to stress the relatedness of formal learning to the human person and the human question and to emphasize the interrelatedness of all areas of knowledge.

Each colloquium was designed to explore a single topic in depth. The central topic was further generalized into a set of intellectual problems. The philosophy was that if a colloquium was intentionally designed to allow faculty and students to "solve" a specific set of intellectual problems then every student of the colloquium potentially would have something to say about those issues.

Bundy also set down guidelines for instruction, noting that the key was to lecture in such a way that dialoque with student opinion was built into the fabric of the lecture and ideas and values were discovered within the context of the lecture; for faculty development, stating that the success of the program related to the willingness and ability of the faculty participants to teach with the specific goals of the

program in mind; and for evaluation, specifying both internal and external evaluation.

Guidelines for evaluation are worth noting. Colloquia were ranked in terms of their conceptual unity, the significance of the materials dealt with, the effectiveness with which the basic skills were transmitted, the diversity of the disciplines represented, high morale, and student and faculty development. Faculty were evaluated in terms of authority, competence, faculty relations, cognitive development, ego strength, clarification of values, relation to discipline position, orientation to teaching, responsibility for change, and curriculum reform.

Musial (1972) in describing the senior seminar/freshmen colloquium at Notre Dame, concluded:

> If liberal learning is person-oriented and holds as its objectives the ability to creatively and rationally use one's intelligence in unfamiliar contexts, the ability to understand the way other people order and use their knowledge, the ability to detect the real from the spurious in areas outside one's specialty, and the ability to deal rationally with the moral and affective dimensions of knowledge, the learning that was exemplified in our experimental project demonstrated the way in which teaching is a liberal art.

Thoroughman (1975), describing the Humanities program at Wofford College, noted among the program goals the relationship of the disciplines to each other and their

mutual supportiveness. One course, Values and Issues in the Humanities, seemed to echo the goals of the SJC Liberal Arts program and had as its objective to bring the major ethical and aesthetic perspectives of the Western Humanistic tradition to bear on issues of moment in contemporary life, primarily through the study of self as defined by relationship to others, to society, to nature, and to the ultimate.

Course methodology is worth noting. Two-thirds of the class periods were devoted to discussions in small groups and the other third to audio-visual presentations and lectures by faculty to the combined sessions.

Rhodes (1985) suggested that liberal education is "not an add-on, but a vital component of professional study. It is concerned with...life, with the social goals a profession promotes and the ethical standards it demands." He called for "structure and incentives that encourage linkage between disciplines and programs..." and noted that the role of the humanities is "not only to explore experience in all its ambiguity and richness <u>but</u> ...to interpret experience."

Planning.

The need for detailed course planning was, of course, delineated in the study of Curriculum and Program Planning. In addition, it has been addressed by a number of writers, although they disagreed on the specificity of the syllabus. McKechie (1986) noted that a syllabus will force the instructor to begin thinking about the practicalities of what he or she must give up in order to fit within the constraints of time, pace, students, available resources, and teacher limitations. Gagne and Briggs (1979) supported a system which includes life-long objectives, end-of-course objectives, unit objectives, and specific performance objectives. Orlich et. al. (1985) advocated a system which includes student entry level, instructional goals, objectives, rationale, content, instructional procedures, materials, evaluation and revision. Herrscher et. al. (1986) have summarized the stages of course and lesson development (from the Gagne and Briggs model) as: determining course structure and sequences, analyzing course objectives, defining performance objectives, preparing lesson plans or modules, developing materials, and assessing student performance.

Parks in The Critical Years (1986) called the syllabus a "confession of faith." She noted that in

preparing a syllabus, "educators confess what they believe to be of value - worthy images, insights, concepts, sources, and methods of learning that they have found lead toward a worthy apprehension of the truth."

Reports cited above of interdisciplinary courses at other institutions stressed the importance of planning, especially in interdisciplinary courses. Hence, Liberal Arts faculty were approached with the idea of developing a detailed syllabus for the seminar. Upon their approval, the procedures described below were instituted.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES

Sources of Data

In developing the syllabus, the proposed course requirements, teaching strategies and procedures, learning resources and activities, and evaluation methods were tested against the goals and behavioral objectives for the course. This was in keeping with the guidelines suggested by Orlich and others (1985). They noted that decisions about course content - that is, what subject matter to include and how much material to cover - demand a strong command of the discipline and the ability to analyze it carefully to isolate those concepts, principles, rules, and facts that are the most significant. They suggested planning and implementation of units and lessons that relate to and originate from the broader goals and culminating experiences that are planned for students. Their plan would be divided into units and would include: instructional goals or unit objectives, performance objectives, rationale, content, instructioal procedures, evaluation procedures, and materials and aids.

Course development was done in several stages.

Faculty interviews. To this end, a student assistant interviewed division faculty and developed a possible reading list. A faculty team working with the student then honed the list to fourteen books or book excerpts. He was to conduct the reading and report back to the faculty with his recommendations and reactions to the books. Should they be included in the seminar or not? Should they be included in course prerequisites? Seven from this list were recommended either for the senior seminar or for an earlier Humanities course. Recommended for earlier courses were: Cervantes' Don Quixote , Sir Thomas Moore's Utopia, and Homer's Odyssey. Recommended for inclusion in the seminar were: Arthur Miller's Death of a Salesman, Machiavelli's The Prince, Shakespeare's Hamlet, and Plato's Republic.

Review of courses at other colleges and universities. Letter were written to a number of colleges with team-taught, interdisciplinary courses asking for copies of their syllabi. Responses were received from the University of Alaska, Fairbanks; University of Alaska, Juneau; California State University, Sacramento; California State University, Chico; Biola University; Southern Oregon State College; and San Francisco State University.

Course syllabi from the above institutions and from the

institutions studied in the initial search of the literature were reviewed. The focus of the review was, first, the instructional approach and, second, the reading lists. The reading lists from those courses most similar in goals and objectives to the proposed seminar were circulated amongst the faculty for response. Some courses focused on the classics. Others focused on modern scientific and philosphical essays.

Since division faculty was familiar with the traditional classics, the next step was to review non-traditional and current material and to circulate an annotated bibliography to the division for reaction. Following this, a proposed reading list for the course, consisting of a primary list of traditional Western classics and a secondary list of modern scientific and philosophical essays, was circulated for faculty response. Following their comments, the primary list was expanded to include non-Western materials.

Student Evaluations

Orlich and others (1985) suggested two types of student evaluation: formative checks and post-instructional assessment. The formative check is an activity that allows the instructor to assess student understanding up to the

point of the check and to make adjustments in instruction in accordance with this information. The post-instructional assessment, also referred to as summative evaluation, refers to that stage in the instructional sequence at which the instructor determines to what degree the learner has attained the anticipated outcomes of the lesson or unit. The evaluation procedures should detail the testing technique to be followed in evaluating student summative behavior and should relate directly to the behavioral objectives stipulated at the beginning of the lesson or unit.

Plans for evaluation were based on methods for evaluation used by Sheldon Jackson College faculty for other courses in the division and used by other institutions included in the study. These, in turn, were assessed in light of the criteria suggested above.

The Final Draft

Thereafter, the final draft of the proposed syllabus as well as a plan for ongoing course evaluation and revision was developed. The latter was developed using institutional criteria (Appendix C) for (1) student and peer instructional evaluation and (2) instructor course evaluation, as well as Northwest Accrediting Association criteria for self study and external evaluation.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Learning Resources

The basic objectives of the senior seminar, as delineated by the Liberal Arts faculty in the course outline, are that students will be able to:

1. State and defend their world views including their understanding of the nature of thought, Deity, nature, humankind, an ordered society, history, and aesthetics;

2. Examine past influences on the development of their world view;

3. Predict future events that might impact their world view; and

4. Challenge and critique the world view of others.

The first task of the division was to determine the learning resources best suited to produce those results. The learning resources required by other institutions were as varied as their objectives. Two institutions, the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, and Columbia University, present the extremes.

Alexander (1986) listed the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, objectives as an understanding of the concepts of man in 20th century philosophy, science, and art; the relationship of art and science in history and education; the idea of the academy vs. the university in higher

education; the concept of the humanities from classical antiquity to the present day; and the humanities in the current American educational system and the future.

The reading list reflected that philosophy, requiring book reviews and analyses from a list composed entirely of 20th century philosophical and scientific writings.

Belnap and Kuhns (1977) noted that in the four Columbia University junior-senior Colloquia, students were required to read ten to a dozen "great books" a semester. The readings ranged over the major works of the West from Homer to Dostoevsky, and the course(s) were designed to meet the needs of the student in the United States:

> who had not had the benefits of a lycee or gymnasium education on the one hand, and who, as citizens of a democracy, had an obligation to be knowledgeable about political matters and analytical in the handling of cultural problems.

Students were required to read a major classic every week or two. Professors justified the speed of the course by noting that "the serious conduct of the class demands juxtipositions, sequence, and direct encounters with a variety of texts."

Arthur Danto (1977) expressed a more theoretical justification:

> our artistic responses to it would be far more meager than if there were two works, assuming we knew the two works...In this sense, readers of Virgil were in a better position to appreciate Homer than were Homer's contemporaries....Works of art form a class with the following property: each addition to it enriches the members so that, in an important sense, art revolutionizes art, and a work of art is a different object after another work of art has been created, than it was before them. The same may be said of our experiences with works of arts....The more works we experience, the richer our experience of any one of them. The limit on the number of works to be experienced in our course is determined only by the limits of a student's capacity to absorb and relate.

The large reading list in original materials excluded modern scholarship. The staffs of the courses justified this in two ways:

> The books are connected as...participants in a continuing enterprise, attacking, defending, imitating, parodying, and annotating their predecessors....These courses define themselves as places to engage a text as directly as possible.

Teaching Strategies

The preliminary outline listed teaching strategies for the Senior Seminar as lectures, group discussion, simulation, and multi-media presentations. This section of the course required the most detailed development.

A lecture format was suggested by the work at Dominican College (Bundy, 1978). The intention of their program was to immerse both student and faculty participants in an educational experience of man as a questioning,

valuing, feeling being, who is at once problem-maker and problem solver. The broad overall goal was to stress the relatedness of formal learning to the human person and the human question and to emphasize the interrelatedness of all areas of knowledge.

Each colloquium was designed to explore a single topic in depth, and the central topic was further generalized into a set of intellectual problems. The philosophy was that if a colloquium was intentionally designed to allow faculty and students to "solve" a specific set of problems, then every student in the colloquium would potentially have something to say about the issues. Faculty were to lecture in such a way that dialogue with student opinion was built into the fabric of the lecture and ideas and values were discussed within the context of the lecture.

The set of problems became themes which were introduced again and again and then synthesized. The problems became the selection principle for the faculty in determining what materials to include.

Notre Dame (Musical, 1972) set up a three part structure for delivery of their senior seminar: first, a theoretical part consisting of a series of lectures outlining the theory of different kinds of knowledge,

values, arts, and disciplines; that is, the knowledge most worth having; second, a planning component exploring with students the practical implications and consequences of positions advanced in the lectures; and third, a practical application allowing seniors to put their knowledge to work by teaching freshmen.

Wofford College (Thoroughman, 1975) used the methodologies and strengths of the humanities and social sciences to study values, problems and issues of the local community. Instructors first made a formal presentation of various value systems through books, music, television etc.; second, introduced students to social science methodology; third, initiated humanistic field studies in the area, fourth, gathered experiences of students coming into the community, and fifth, created the sense that students and faculty were full associates in a community of learning.

Knier (1987) described the proposed delivery of a new senior level course at San Francisco State University that would be presented in a manner applicable to the Sheldon Jackson College setting. The course, Thought and Image, was conceived as a cross-school, cross-discipline, team-taught offering. Teams would be supplemented by guest lecturers keyed to the works being studied (e.g. a classicist or philosopher to examine Plato's Apology). Each team

supervising a course would propose its own pairs of works for scrutiny and analysis. A principal feature of the course would be the selection of key works to serve as paradigms for such themes as thought and image, convergence and divergence, impact on style and culture, etc.

To facilitate discussion the course would feature small group discussions led by student leaders and monitored by instructors. These groups would assume responsibility for analyzing some dimension of the work or works under discussion and would share their findings with the class as a whole.

Course Requirements

The next point of development related to course requirements. What specific tasks would students be asked to complete that would (1) assist in their meeting course objectives, and (2) allow faculty to assess their learning?

Alexander (1986) noted that the University of Alaska, Fairbanks required three reports and a research paper from students in their senior seminar.

Students were required to (1) write and orally present three books reports chosen from the recommended reading list and (2) present a critical analysis - including basic assumptions, context and goals - with evaluation in their own context. These reports were presented for discussion.

Finally, the student was to write and orally present a research paper as part of a comprehensive final. The subject was seen as a summary of the individual's learning experience within the humanities program and an evaluation of the candidate's prospects in the future - in the Humanities or elsewhere.

Pasquan (1986) reported that the University of Alaska, Juneau, required an independent thesis in the student's major area as approved by the Bachelor of Liberal Arts committee. The thesis might include scientific, sociological, historical, or literary research, or creative endeavors such as a collection of poetry, short stories, a novel, or works in the visual arts, music or theatre.

Harley (1986) noted that upper division Humanities courses at California State University, Sacramento, required a combination of midterm and final essay examinations and analytical papers.

Cornell (1986) reported that Biola University required project reports at three levels:

> First time seminar participants present a critical problem or question that has been raised in their reading experience - the focus is on their interaction with the text. They present solutions to the problems as found in their research and an evaluation justifying their solutions.

> Second time participants present a critical problem raised in their reading, then draw on the range of critical opinions found in their research to present their own theses.
>
> Third time participants lead a theoretical discussion of the text. Prior to the discussion session, they hand out a list of questions, based on their reading of the text and its criticism, that they want all seminar participants to consider.

According to Kaida (1986), California State University, Chico, required a term paper on critical theory. No examinations were given.

Evaluation

Bundy (1979) noted that evaluation of the program at Dominican consisted of in-house program evaluation and outside evaluation by consultants. Evaluation instruments were individual and group interviews and written course evalutions. Every student in the program was interviewed individually at the beginning of the program and in a group at the end. Each faculty member was interviewed individually and in a group.

Colloquia were ranked in terms of conceptual unity, significance of the material dealt with, effectiveness with which the basic skills were transmitted, the diversity of the disciplines represented, high morale, and student and faculty development.

Faculty were evaluated in terms of authority, competence, faculty relations, cognitive development, ego strength, clarification of values, relation to discipline position, orientation to teaching, and responsibility for change and curriculum reform.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Course Design

The syllabus as recommended to the faculty (Appendix D) specifies course content, objectives, course requirements, instructional procedures for each objective, learning resources and evaluation procedures. It also includes a weekly plan for delivery.

After an indepth review of the bibliography from the various universities and in particular Columbia University and the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, the best approach to the seminar, given the focus of the course and the expertise of the faculty, would be the "great books" approach.

The reading list would be selected by faculty and students from a reading list composed of works from Classical Antiquity; Medieval, Renaissance and 17th Century Europe; 18th through 20th Century Europe; and American Literature and Historical Documents; augmented, as appropriate, by non-Western works.

A total of twelve major works would be read and discussed in the course of the semester. Modern

philosophical and scientific texts, drawn from a supplemental list, would be used, as appropriate, by faculty in leading discussions and by students in presenting papers.

The theme for the course would be The Great Conversation. Discussions would focus on the idea (presented by Danto and others) that what one writes today is influenced by what has been written before. The world view of the various authors, as evidenced by their works, would be discussed and would lead to discussion and defense of the world view of students and faculty.

Course Delivery

The delivery pattern for the senior seminar, considered in light of the pattern at other institutions, would consist of introductory lectures by faculty for each of the four classical eras. These would be followed by discussion sessions, to be led by teams of students. Each team would be responsible for two or three of the works to be reviewed. Final sessions would consist of presentations of final papers for discussion and defense.

Student Requirements

Students in the senior seminar would be required to:

1. Review, in writing and orally, two to three of the works being studied. Each review will be from a different period.

2. Lead two or more sessions related to those works. Each leadership assignment will be from a different period.

3. Read all the works assigned for the course.

4. Present and defend, in writing and orally, a ten page term paper elaborating on their world view.

5. Complete a comprehensive final exam.

To pass the course students must complete all assignments. Course grades will depend on the level at which each assignment is completed.

Evaluation

Criteria are in place for course and instructor evaluation at Sheldon Jackson College. Student and peer evaluation forms cover many of the criteria suggested in the Dominican model.

Additionally, the institution is evaluated by the Northwest Accrediting Association. Especially relevant to external evaluation of the seminar are several questions relating to course offerings and teaching methods:

1. Courses offered:

   a. Are they related precisely to the objectives?
   b. Are the syllabi current and complete?
   c. What are the practices followed to encourage and

ensure the continual upgrading of course content?

2. Teaching:

   a. What library, media, and special aids are available for the improvement of teaching?
   b. What devises are used to evaluate the effectiveness of individual instruction and general departmental effectiveness?

Time Line

The Liberal Arts degree will be instituted in Fall of 1987. The senior seminar is scheduled to be offered for the first time in Spring of 1989. Since there are a few students who will be seniors in the program in advance of that date, the course will be piloted in Spring of 1988, evaluated, and revised before its full implementation in 1989.

Continuing Development

The study has pointed out the need for extensive planning of interdisciplinary courses. This was emphasized by most of the colleges and universities in this study. Also recommended was continued faculty development in curriculum planning and in interdisciplinary teaching. These needs are recognized by the division and federal funds are being sought to assist the division in meeting those needs.

REFERENCES

Alexander, Barbara F. Personal letter. October 21, 1986

Association of American Colleges. A Search for Qualty and Coherence in Baccalaureate Education . Washington, D.C.: Association of American College, undated.

--------- Widening the Circle: The Humanities in American Education . Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, undated.

Belknap, Robert and Richard Kuhns. Tradition and Innovation: General Education and the Reintegration of the University . New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Bennett, William J. To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education . Washington D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, November 1984.

Broderick, Francis. "What Are the Humanities?" Paper presented at a conference sponsored by the Association of American College and the National Endowment for the Humanities, Princeton, New Jersey, April 27-29, 1983.

Bundy, Barbara, "The One and the Manny: A Colloquia Program in Humanities at Dominican Coolege of San Rafael" in Liberal Education, 65:1:30-44, Spring 1979.

Buzza, Bonnie Wilson. "Senior Seminar: Synethesis and Head Start." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Louisville, Kentucky, November 4-7, 1982.

Cornell, Daniel. Personal Letter. October 21, 1986.

Danto, Arthur, in Belnap and Kuhns, Tradition and Innovation . New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Gagne, Robert M. and Leslie J. Briggs. Principles of Instructional Design , 2nd Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Gregory, Michael. "NEXA: The Science-Humanities Convergence Program at San Francisco State University" in Liberal Education, 65:1:66-91, Spring 1979.

Harley, Barbara. Personal letter. September 17, 1986.

Knier, Ruth. "Thought and Image I and II." Unpublished Course Proposal. San Francisco State University, August 1984.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. Teaching Tips: A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher, 8th Edition. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1986.

Michener, James, CBS Morning News Interview on the occasion of his $2 million gift to Swarthmore College, September 26, 1984.

Miller, Myron, "The Challenge for the Future," Unpublished Course Syllabus. Seattle Pacific University, Summer 1983.

Musial, Thomas J. "Teaching as a Liberal Art" in Notre Dame Journal of Education, 3:1:27-86, Spring 1972.

Orlich, Robert et. al. Teaching Strategies: A Guide to Better Instruction . Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1985.

Parks, Sharon. "Higher Education: A Community of Imagination" in The Critical Years: The Young Adult Search for a Faith to Live By. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986.

Pasquan, Lisa. Personal letter. September 19, 1986.

Rhodes, Frank J. "Reforming Higher Education Will Take More than Just Tinkering with Curricula," undated material from Division files.

Spitzberg, Irving. "The Practical Value of the Liberal Arts' in Perspectives: Expanding Horizons in a Shrinking World . 16:1:6-10, Spring 1986:

Stevens, Robert. "Restructuring the Liberal Arts" in Liberal Education . 71:2:163-65, Summer 1985.

Thoroughman, Thomas. "Values and Issues: The Humanities Program at Wolford College" in Liberal Education . 65:1:98-110, Spring 1979.

APPENDIX A

LIBERAL ARTS DIVISION
LONG-RANGE PLAN
1986 - 1989

SHELDON JACKSON COLLEGE ARTS MAJOR AND COURSE OFFERINGS
LONG-RANGE PLANS

STATEMENT OF CHANGE: In order to strengthen the current associate of arts degree, to provide meaningful upper division courses in the liberal arts to students in the bachelor's degree programs in Elementary Education, Aquatic Resources, Natural Resource Management and Development, and Business Administration, and to prepare for a bachelor's degree in the liberal arts, the liberal arts division proposes to revise or develop lower division humanities core courses and requirements and to revise and expand the upper division courses in the liberal arts. The proposed changes would:

1. Provide essential humanities instruction for all students.

2. Provide upper division courses to meet the needs of students in the various Bachelor's degree programs.

3. Provide both upper and lower division programs in the liberal arts that would enable the institution to offer a bachelor's degree in the liberal arts by 1987 and that would provide emphasis areas in Humanities, Social Sciences, and General Studies.

TIME FRAME:

Implementation of upper division courses for non-majors	1985-87
Implementation of revised courses and requirements for lower division students in Liberal Arts	1986-87
Implementation of revised courses and requirements for non-majors	1987-88
Implementation of Bachelor's degree in Liberal Arts	1987-89

OBJECTIVES: The objectives of the program are that Sheldon Jackson graduates should be able to:

1. Demonstrate the ability to effectively write and speak in standard English and the ability to read critically and imaginatively.

2. Accept the uniqueness and worth of others and themselves as demonstrated by their abilities to recognize positive attributes of others, to identify ethnocentric attitudes, to explain how their unique selves developed in regard to their cultures and environment and to explain how the cultures and environment of others in the community influenced their behavior.

3. Demonstrate responsible citizenship as manifested by their abilities to analyze and assess ethical problems, issues of public policy and the questions of value underlying science and technology.

4. Demonstrate a familiarity with the Christian scriptures and the basic tenets of the Christian faith and be aware of how varied the expression of these beliefs has been in different times and places.

5/1/86

5. Recognize the lasting contribution made by the arts and humanities to humankind as demonstrated by their abilities to understand the place of the arts in the history of humankind, to understand fundamental artistic principles, and to participate in one or more creative endeavors.

6. Understand that different people of the earth hold different world views and come to appreciate that religious, political, economic, and social systems are all part of a people's expression of those views.

RATIONALE:

1. The program will address the concerns expressed by the State Department of Education that students in the education program attain an understanding and appreciation of:

   a. language skills as essential tools in communication.

   b. world literature with emphasis on, but not limited to, the writings of English and American authors.

   c. the aesthetic values in human experience expressed through the fine arts.

   d. contemporary world culture.

   e. American's pluralistic culture and heritage.

2. The program will better achieve parts of the Covenant between Sheldon Jackson College and the Synod of Alaska-Northwest of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., specifically those agreements to:

   a. keep its curricula under continuous study in order to serve the educational, spiritual, cultural, and occupational needs of students and society, and

   b. provide quality education to integrate the intellectual, cultural, and religious concerns and needs as they relate to Alaskan peoples.

3. The program will better meet eight of the institutional goals:

   a. to communicate effectively.

   b. to make realistic career choices.

   c. to accept the uniqueness and worth of others and themselves.

   d. to demonstrate responsible citizenship.

   e. to recognize the impact of Jesus Christ upon the world.

   f. to apply principles of logic to everyday situations.

   g. to explain and use scientific inquiry in the social sciences.

   h. to recognize the lasting contribution made by the arts and humanities to humankind.

4. The proposed program is an institutional priority in that we cannot be a liberal arts institution without breadth and depth in the arts, humanities, and social sciences, nor can we be sensitive to the cultural diversity of our student body and our state without study in these areas.

5. The program will meet a regional need for study in the Liberal Arts. We bring to our curriculum: Christian context, cultural resources, and a small caring college community. We take the student from where he is. We have early involvement in arts activities and in arts in a humanities context. We offer increased opportunities for participation in these programs and interdepartmental encouragement of such participation.

6. The program will address a national concern about the lack of Humanities instruction in the public schools by preparing elementary teachers to teach and value the Liberal Arts.

7. The program will address several concerns of the institutional long-range plan, specifically those which call for the institution to determine the consolidation, revision, and/or development of programs.

8. The program will address the concerns expressed by the Rockefeller Commission on the Humanities that the humanities should develop within the students the mental capacities and historical knowledge needed for:

   a. effective command of written and spoken English.

   b. enjoyment and informed judgement of the arts.

   c. understanding of other cultures.

   d. analysis and assessment of ethical problems, issues of public policy, and the questions of value underlying science and technology.

METHOD: The program proposes to institute the Rockefeller recommendations to:

1. Provide instruction in writing that is spread across the course of study, that includes evaluation of writing in the junior and senior year, and that requires all faculty to grade papers for form and thought as well as content.

2. Provide courses which integrate themes and subjects from the liberal arts disciplines with each other and with other fields.

3. Provide clear sequences of courses in each of three disciplines of the liberal arts: humanities, social sciences, and general studies.

4. Use resources from local cultural institutions.

5. Develop new materials and methods for the teaching of arts, humanities, and social sciences.

MARKET CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Both lower and upper division Humanities, Arts, and Social Science courses appeal to students majoring in other subjects because of their emphasis on the awareness and acceptance of diverse cultures.

2. The business world requires its personnel to have a broad liberal education. It is placing increasing emphasis on hiring generalists rather than specialists, heeding the dictum that specialization is for insects. The U.S. Forest Service, I.B.M., Medical Schools, A.T. and T., Bank of America, Power Companies look for liberal arts background. Native and other corporations look for liberal arts education.

3. There is a continuing demand for teachers in rural Alaska. Currently 80% of the teachers in the state are from outside of Alaska. Since teacher turn-over in rural Alaska is 44%, it is safe to assume that there will be a continuing market for Native and non-Native Alaskan teachers, and that they will be enrolled in the Liberal Arts courses.

4. Students majoring in Liberal Arts will, upon completion of their B.A. degree, have skills that will allow them to enter such fields as: proposal writing, public relations, journalism, advertising, technical writing, legislative staffing, and research. They will be able to continue their education with graduate studies in several areas.

5. Since more than half of our lower division students are majoring in general studies, the Bachelor's program will allow them to continue or complete their studies at Sheldon Jackson College. The program will generate its own market.

DETAILED PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

A. In order to strengthen the current associate degrees, the Liberal Arts Division proposes to provide humanities instruction for all students.

   1. The present Humanities 220, 221 courses will be revised to freshman level courses in order to give students an earlier experience in the concepts that the division feels are essential to a liberal arts education. The first course (Humanities 120) will focus upon the following Humanities concepts: the nature of thought, the nature of God, the nature of nature, and the nature of humankind. The second course will cover: the nature of a properly ordered society, the nature and role of history, and the nature of aesthetics.

   2. The present Religion/Philosophy requirement will be changed from 6 credits to 3 credits (either 121 or 122) and the concepts taught in the present Religion 201 class (World Religions) will be included in the proposed Humanities 120, 121 sequence.

   3. The division will offer a new course, to be numbered Humanities 222, which will address the nature of creativity, discuss creativity in relation to themes, and involve the students in some creative endeavor leading to publication, exhibition, or performance.

4. A draft of the proposed changes in institutional requirements follows:

a. Bachelor of Arts:

Current Humanities		Proposed Humanities	
Human. 220, 221, 320 or 321	3 cr.	Human. 120, 121	6 cr.
Visual/Perf. Arts	3 cr.	Human, 222	3 cr.
Rel. 121, 122 or 201	3 cr.	Rel. 121 or 122	3 cr.
Rel./Phil. Elective	3 cr.	Human. or FA Elec.	6 cr.
Human. Elect.	6 cr.		18 cr.
	18 cr.		
6 u.d required		no u.d. required	
Current Social Science		Proposed Social Science	
Anthro.	3 cr.	Anthro.	3 cr.
Electives	12 cr.*	Electives (at least one course in each of 3 Soc. Sci. areas)	12*
	15 cr.		15 cr.
*6 u.d. required		*6 u.d. required	

b. Bachelor of Science

Current Humanities		Proposed Humanities	
Human. 220, 221, 320 or 321	3 cr.	Human. 120, 121	6 cr.
Vis./Perf. Arts	3 cr.	Human. 222	3 cr.
Rel. 121, 122, or 201	3 cr.	Rel. 121 or 122	3 cr.
Rel./Phil. Elective	3 cr.	Human./FA Elec.	3 cr.
Human Elective	3 cr.		15 cr.
	15 cr. *		
*3 u.d. required		No u.d. required	
Current Social Science		Proposed Social Science	
Anthro.	3 cr.	Anthro.	3 cr.
Electives	6 cr.*	Electives (one course in each of 3 Sco. Sci. areas)	9 cr.* 12 cr.
	9 cr.		
3 u.d. required		6 u.d. required	

B. Upper Division Courses for Other Majors.

1. General courses for all upper division students:

Humanities	Social Science
Eng. 422	Anthro. 360
Eng. 453	Anthro. 490
Eng. 490*	Hist. 321
Hum. 320	Hist. 322
Hum. 321	Hist. 324
Rel. 301	Hist. 331
Rel. 322	Pol. Sci. 350
TA 350, 450	Pol. Sci. 450
TA 360	

2. Specific Courses to Support Majors:

Education Major	Business	Aquatic Res./Nat. Res.
Art 356	Eng. 321	Eng. 380
Eng. 305	Sp. 330	Sp. 330
Mus. 354		
TA 333		

3. Courses for New Majors in Liberal Arts:

Art 4xx (Special Projects in Art)
Mus. 4xx (Special Projects in Music)
Mus. 455 Musical Theatre
LA 4xx (Independent Study in Liberal Arts)
Psy. 3xx (Upper Division Psychology to be developed)
LA 497 Senior Seminar in Liberal Arts

C. Bachelor's Degree in Liberal Arts

1. The Liberal Arts Division proposes that Sheldon Jackson College offer a Bachelor's degree in the Liberal Arts which would have three emphasis options: Humanities, Social Science, and General Studies.

2. The proposed requirements for the major are as follows:

a. Courses which fulfill general institutional requirements:

HUMANITIES EMP.		SOC. SCI. EMP.		GEN. STUDIES EMP.	
English 321	(3)	English 321	(3)	English 321	(3)
Speech 120	(3)	Phil. 250	(3)	Human. 120, 121	(6)
Hum. 120, 121	(6)	Hum. 120 or 121	(3)	Biol. 113-114	(8)
Phil. Elec.	(3)	Hist.	(3)		
CS 155	(3)	Poli. Sci.	(3)		
Anthro/Hist.	(6)	Econ.	(3)		
300/400 Level		Psych.	(3)		

b. Major courses:

Human. 222	3	Human. 222	3	Human. 222	3
6 U.D. cr. in each of 3 Hum. areas	18	6 U.D. cr. in each of 3 Soc. Sci. areas	18	U.D. Human. or Soc. Sci.	18
		Math 180	3		
		Sociology	3	U.D. Math/Sci.	15
Human. Elec.	6	Soc. Sci. Elec.	6		
Ind. Study	6	Ind. Study	6		
Sen. Sem.	3	Sen. Sem.	3	Sen. Sem.	3
	36		42		39

3. Upper division courses in other areas to support the new major are:

Zool. 401	Ed. 305, 378, 405, 415, 476, 479
Bs. Ad. 300	Res. 321, 331, 420

D. The division proposes to revise Humanities 220, 221 to Human. 120, 121, to eliminate 3 credits of the religion/philosophy requirement and incorporate elements of world religion into Human. 120/121 and to revise the present Associates degrees as follows:

1. General AA:

Current Humanities		Proposed Humanities	
Rel. 121, 122 or 201	3 cr.	Rel. 121 or 122	3 cr.
Rel./Phil.	3 cr.	Hum. 120, 121	6 cr.
Hum. 220, 221, or FA	3 cr.	Human. 222	3 cr.
Hum. Elective	3 cr.	Hum. or FA Elec.	3 cr.
	12 cr.		15 cr.
Current Soc. Stud.		Proposed Social Studies	
Electives	9 cr.	Anthro.	3 cr.
		Electives	6 cr.
			9 cr.

2. General AS:

Current Humanities		Proposed Humanities	
Rel. 121, 122, or 201	3 cr.	Rel. 121 or 122	3 cr.
Rel./Phil	3 cr.	Human. 120, 121	6 cr.
Hum. Elective	3 cr.	Human. 222	3 cr.
	9 cr.		12 cr.
Curernt Soc. Sci.		Proposed Soc. Sci.	
Electives	6 cr.	Anthro.	3 cr.
		Elective	3 cr.
			6 cr.

3. AA in Humanities:

Current Humanities		Proposed Humanities	
Rel. 121, 122 or 201	3 cr.	Rel. 121 or 122	3 cr.
Rel./Phil. Elec.	3 cr.	Hum. 121, 122	6 cr.
Hum. 220, 221	6 cr.	Hum. 222	3 cr.
Fine Arts Electives	6 cr.	Fine Arts Electives	6 cr.
Human. Electives	6 cr.	Human. Electives	6 cr.
	24 cr.		24 cr.
Current Social Studies		Proposed Social Studies	
Anthro 121, 230 or Hist. 201	3 cr.	Anthro. 121, 230, or Hist. 201	3 cr.
Poli. Sci.	3 cr.	Poli. Sci.	3 cr.
Electives	6 cr.	Electives	6 cr.
	12 cr.		12 cr.

STAFFING IMPLICATIONS:

In order to strengthen upper division offerings while maintaining strong lower division courses, the following are needed:

Current English: 1 full-time English, 2 part-time (shared with Speech-Thea.) (excluding L.C. staff)
Needed: 2 full-time English

Current Speech-Theatre Arts: 1 full-time
Needed: A tech. person on staff (not necessarily faculty)

Current History: 1 full-time (overload)
Needed: 1 full-time, 1 half-time (split with Poli. Sci./Anthro.)

Current Anthro.: 1 part-time split with Poli. Sci.
Needed: 1 full-time, 1 half-time (split with History)

Current Art: 1 full-time, 1 part-time
Needed: 1 full-time, 4 part-time

Current Music: 1 DFF
Needed: 1 full-time

Current Humanities: 2 overload
Needed: no additional if adjustments are made in subject areas.

Current Religion/Philosophy: 1 half-time (also Chaplain), 1 DFF (half-time)
Needed: no additional staff in immediate future, eventually one half-time (also Chaplain), 1 full-time

Current Psych.: 1 full-time (with Coop. Ed. assignments)
Needed: no additional staff in immediate future

SUPPORT SERVICES:

Students studying in the Liberal Arts have access to Stratton Library and to other libraries in the state through inter-library loan; to three museums - the Sheldon Jackson Museum, the Isabel Miller Museum, and the Russian Bishop's House; to the work of craftsmen at the Cultural Center and the ANB Hall; to the collection of icons at St. Michael's Russian Orthodox Cathedral; to performances by the New Archangel (Russian) Dancers, the Gaja-heen (Tlinget) Dancers and the Filipino Dancers. They can participate in productions by the Baranof Theatre Guild, Pioneer Repertory Theatre and community choral groups. They can view performances sponsored by the Alaska Humanities Forum, the Greater Sitka Arts Council, Alaska Arts Southeast, and Raven Radio, as well as by the college. For a time they can interact with writer James Michener during his residency on the campus.

TOTALS:

There are currently 7 full-time faculty members in the Liberal Arts Division (excluding Learning Center staff), 2 DFFs and 3 part-time faculty. Total faculty needs are: 10 full-time, 1 DFF, and 2 part-time. If we count each part-time and DFF position as half, the present staff is the equivalent of 9.5 full-time positions and the proposed staff would be the equivalent of 11.5 positions. The increase to add the Bachelor's program would be 2 positions.

LRP approved by division March 1986. BA in Liberal Arts approved by Faculty April 1, 1986.

JCDS37/P

APPENDIX B

OUTLINE, HUMANITIES 490, SENIOR SEMINAR

Course Outline

Humanities 490: Senior Seminar in the Liberal Arts
Instructor: Division
Date to be taught: Spring 1988
Prerequisite: English 321 or 380
3 credits

Course description: A course required of all seniors in the Liberal Arts program. Students will be asked to reflect upon, define and evaluate the college learning experiences which contribute to the development of their world view. A culminating project which synthesizes their learning is required.

Objwctives: Students will be able to:

1. State and defend their world views including their understanding of:

    a. the nature of thought
    b. the nature of the Deity
    c. the nature of nature
    d. the nature of the Human Being
    e. the nature of an ordered society
    f. the nature of history
    g. the nature of aesthetics

2. Examine past influences on the development of their world view

3. Predict future events that might impact their world view

4. Challenge and critique the world view of others in the course

Course requirements:

1. Mandatory attendence

2. Participation in class discussion

3. Completion of all assignments

4. Completion of culminating project

Teaching strategies:

1. Lectures by faculty and guests

2. Group interaction

3. Simulations

4. Multi-media presentations

Learning resources: Sheldon Jackson Library, selected readings, interlibrary loan

Evaluation ans criteria for grading:

To pass the class at a satisfactory level (C or higher), students must:

1. Complete all assignments, including the culminating project, at a satisfactory level of performance

2. Participate in all class activities

3. Attend all sessions (unless excused by the instructor(s))

Passed by Academic Programs 2/25/86

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION FORMS

SHELDON JACKSON COLLEGE
STUDENT OPINION POLL

Dept. & Course No._____ Course Title_____

Instructor_____ Semester_____ 19____

Please Complete the Form Below by Circling the Response that Best Reflects Your Feelings About this Course.

PART I. SELF - EVALUATION	CIRCLE ONE
1. About how many sessions of this course have you missed?	0-3 4-7 8 or more
2. About how many assignments did you complete?	all most a few
3. What grade do you think you deserve in this course?	A B C D F P NP
4. For you, is this course	REQUIRED ELECTIVE

PART II. INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION	EXCELLENT	GOOD	ADEQUATE	POOR
1. Rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter.	4	3	2	1
2. Rate the instructor's daily class preparation.	4	3	2	1
3. Please rate the ability of the instructor to communicate the subject matter.	4	3	2	1
4. Overall rating of the instructor as an effective teacher	4	3	2	1
5. Please rate the course as to its meeting stated course objectives.	4	3	2	1
6. Please rate the helpfulness of the instructor in providing feedback regarding your progress (i.e., tests, paper returns, conferences, individual help).	4	3	2	1
7. Please rate the fairness and impartiality of grading	4	3	2	1
8. Would you recommend this instructor to a friend?.		YES	NO	

PART III. COURSE EVALUATION	EXCELLENT	GOOD	ADEQUATE	POOR
1. Rate the textbook used in this course. .	4	3	2	1
2. Rate the tests given (as to number, difficulty, length, etc.).	4	3	2	1
3. Rate the course as to raising one's level as an educated person.	4	3	2	1
4. Would you recommend this course to a friend?		YES	NO	

PLEASE MAKE ANY FURTHER COMMENTS WHICH WILL HELP THE INSTRUCTOR AND COLLEGE IMPROVE THIS COURSE. YOU MAY USE THE BACK OF THIS SHEET FOR FURTHER COMMENTS.

MGCM05/P

SELF AND PEER EVALUATION PROCEDURES

In 1980, the faculty adopted the following self and peer evaluation procedures. The evaluation schedule for each instructor should be such that all courses taught are evaluated every three years. The process is to be monitored by each division.

INSTRUCTOR COURSE EVALUATION SEQUENCE:

1. List your course objectives in order of their priority (see p. 3.3 for course syllabus procedures).

2. Respond to the following questions or statements:

   (a) Do the objectives match the course description in the catalog? Do they match the expectations of others who use the course as a prerequisite?

   (b) List for each course objective the institutional objective as PRIMARY or COMPLEMENTARY for each, and ascertain if they are appropriate to the course or catalog descriptions (see p. 4.1).

   (c) For each course objective, list the "entry" requirement for your student

3. List the activities that students must complete to achieve the objectives.

4. Evaluate the amount of time you spend in class and require students to spend out of class to fulfill each objective. Compare the distribution of time with your prioritization of objectives.

5. Re-examine the requirements you listed in Step 2 (c) of entry level requirements for students. What do you do instructionally to accommodate students' lack of essential requirements?

6. Which learning activities work best/worst? Why?

7. Summarize the means used to determine how well your course objectives have been fulfilled.

PEER EVALUATION SEQUENCE:

1. Select a colleague with whom you are comfortable.
2. Share your course syllabus with the colleague.
3. Invite him/her to visit your class, or prepare a video tape for his/her perusal.
4. Provide the colleague with goals and objectives for the visitation.
5. After the visitation, arrange a conference.
6. Write up the results of the conference and both sign it.
7. File the peer conference report with the Vice President for Academic Pr
8. Confer with Vice President for Academic Programs.
9. Return the favor to a colleague.

INSTRUCTOR COURSE EVALUATION

STEP 1. List your course objectives in order of their priority to you putting most important first. (Be prepared to re-order these later if you discover cause, and to add objectives which you may also discover.)

STEP 2. Write out the answers to three sets of questions:

(a.) Does your list of objectives match the course description in the catalog? Does it match the expectations of others who use the course as a prerequisite? Should you revise to meet those external demands? If so, what other objectives must be added? How should the course description now be revised?

(b.) List for each course objective the institutional objective as PRIMARY or COMPLEMENTARY for each. (Do not be surprised if some course objectives cannot be directly traced to institutional ones!).

(c.) For each course objectives describe the 'entry' condition of your students: (1) What prior learnings do they bring which are essential or prerequisite to this objective? (If they lack essentials you need to consider how you plan to help them get those learnings.) (2) What sense of need do the students brings to accomplishing that objective? (If they have none, you will need to develop it as a part of your pedagogical plan!). (3) What motivations do the students brings to each objective? (All students have things which motivate them; if there is no direct line between their motivations and your objective, you may have to create a bridge if the learning is to take place).

STEP 3. Make a task analysis of each course objective. List each step that a student takes (in the order to be taken) to get your objective fulfilled. Keep 'backing up' until you're sure that you have anticipated all the things the student need to do. Try to think like the student so you don't avoid any step.

STEP 4. You are now moving to evaluation of your 'pedogogy' -- everything you do and ask students to do to enhance their learning. Describe the amount of time you spend in class and require students to spend out of class to fulfill each objective. How well does this distribution of time match your prioritization of objectives? Are there changes you should make to get a better fit between time allocation and objective priority?

STEP 5. Examine each objective in the light of the taxonomies of educational objectives. After classifying each objective within the cognitive, affective, psychomotor domains, determine if you have adequately prepared students for that learning task. Remember that the levels are sequential, i.e., some aspect of each preceeding domain level must preceed the next level. Suggest corrections in your sequences of learning activities to accommodate the hierarchies.

STEP 6. Examine each objective in the light of principles of learning theory, specifically RETENTION, MOTIVATION, TRANSFER. Describe what you are doing to apply those principles of learning properly and what modifications you plan to make to apply each better.

STEP 7. Examine the description you made in step 2c of entry level of students. Describe what you do instructionally to accommodate student's lack of prior essential learnings, needs and motivations. Note: The failure or difficulty students have in accomplishing a particular objective or sub-objective may be explainable in this evaluative step. You may need to adjust learning activities to recognize one or more 'gaps'.

STEP 8. Which of the learning activities works best/worst? Analyze why for each according to what you do to make them work. Establish a list of things to improve (and perhaps abandon or add) according to your own estimate of the kinds of learning activities that best suit your personality and teaching style.

STEP 9. Examine how you measure and make judgements about the degree to which your course objectives have been fulfilled.

(a.) Are you measuring fulfillment of what you say are the objective (Don't kid yourself here; it may be easy to measure some things so you fall in the trap of doing that without really measuring the objectives

(b.) Are you weighing heaviest and spending most time measuring/evaluating the highest priority objectives? What changes should you make?

(c.) Are considering the student limitations you described earlier (step 2c) to give the best advantage to students to demonstrate fulfillment of objectives? What changes/alternatives might you make to do this better?

(d.) Are you making the best possible use of your time in evaluating fulfillment of objectives? What short cuts can you take without jeopardizing 9a, 9b, 9c? How can students help you (without leading them into temptation)?

APPENDIX D

SYLLABUS, HUMANITIES 490, SENIOR SEMINAR

COURSE NO.: HUM 490 Senior Seminar in Liberal Arts

INSTRUCTOR: Jan Craddick and team

TEXTS:

DATE TAUGHT: Spring 1988 Prerequisites: English 321 or 380

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

A course required of all seniors in the Liberal Arts. Students will be asked to reflect upon, define and evaluate the college learning experiences which contribute to the development of their world view. A research project which synthesizes their learning is required.

COURSE CONTENT:

Reading for the course will be selected by faculty and students from a list composed of works from Classical Antiquity; Medieval, Renaissance and 17th Century Europe, 18th through 20th Century Europe; American Literature; and historical documents; and a selection of non-Western works. A total of 12 works (complete or excerpted if necessary) will be read and discussed in the course of the semester. Modern philosophical and scientific works will be used, as appropriate, by faculty and students in their discussions.

Discussions will focus on the idea of the Great Conversation, that what one creates today is influenced by what has been created before. The world view of various authors and artists, as evidenced by their works, will be discussed and will lead to discussion and defense of the world views of faculty and students.

OBJECTIVES: Students will be able to:

1. State and defend their world views, including their understanding of thought, the Deity, nature, humankind, an ordered society, history, and aesthetics.
2. Examine past influences on the development of their world view.
3. Predict future events that might impinge on their world vies.
4. Challenge and critique the world view of others in the course.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS: Student must:

1. Review, in writing and orally, two to three of the works being studied. Each review will be from a different period.
2. Lead two or more sessions related to those works. Each leadership assignment will be from a different period.
3. Read all the works assigned for the course.
4. Present and defend, in writing or documented and orally, research paper or project elaborating on their world view. (10 pages minimum)
5. Complete a comprehensive final examination.

TEACHING STRATEGIES AND PROCEDURES:

OBJECTIVE 1: State and defend their world view...

a. Discussion by professor
b. Discussion by students
c. Analytical reports by students
d. Term paper or project by students
e. Final comprehensive exam

OBJECTIVE 2: Examine past influences on the development of their world view.

a. Lectures by professor and guests
b. Reading of and discussion of classic texts by students
c. Analytical reports by students

OBJECTIVE 3: Predict future events that might impact world view.

a. Lectures on contemporary texts and issues by guests
b. Reading of contemporary texts by students
c. Term paper or project by students
d. Final comprehensive exam

OBJECTIVE 4: Challenge and critique the world view of others.

a. Discussion of classic and contemporary texts by professor, guest and students
b. Reports by students
c. Term paper or project by students

LEARNING RESOURCES:

Twelve books will be selected from the attached list of classics. Three books will be selected from each period. Additional readings will be selected for discussion from the attached supplemental list.

EVALUATION AND CRITERIA FOR GRADING: To pass the course at a satisfactory level (C or higher), students must:

1. Complete all assignments, including the term project and the final examination, at a satisfactory level of performance.
2. Participate in all class activities.
3. Attend all sessions (unless excused by instructor(s).

Additional Assessment factor: Class Attendance

COURSE EVALUATION:

Students will be asked to evaluate the course at the end of the semester of study in terms of the significance of the material dealt with, the diversity of the disciplines represented, and the student development.

JCCM19/P

Humanities 490

Reading List - Primary Texts

Western Humanities

Classical Antiquity:

Homer, The Odyssey ; The Iliad
Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound
Sophocles, Antigone ; Oedipus
Euripedes, Medea
Thuydides, History of the Peloponnesian War
Plato, Republic
Aristotle, Ethics
(The Bible), Job
Virgil, Aeniad

Medieval, Renaissance, 17th Century Europe

Saint Augustine, Confessions
Dante, Inferno
Chaucer, Canterbury Tales
Montaigne, Selected Essays
Cervantes, Don Quixote
Shakespeare, Lear ; Hamlet
Calderon de la Barca, Life is a Dream
Milton, Paradise Lost
Machiavelli, The Prince
Sir Thomas Moore, Utopia

18th through 20th Century Europe

Bronte, Charlotte, Jane Eyre
Moliere, Misanthrope ; Tartuffe
Swift, Gulliver's Travels
Voltaire, Candide
Goethe, Faust
Rousseau, Confessions
Nietsche, Beyond Good and Evil
Doestoevsky, Crime and Punishment
Tolstoy, War and Peace
Shaw, Man and Superman
Trotsky, History and the Russian Revolution
Freud, Civilization and Its Discontents
Mann, Death in Venice
Kafka, Metamorphosis
Austen, Pride and Prejudice

Blake
Browning
Tennyson
Joyce, James, Dubliners

From American Literature and Historical Documents

The Federalist Papers
The Lincoln-Douglas Debates
Twain, Huckleberry Finn
Martin Luther King's "Letters from the Birmingham Jail"
Vonnegut, Slaughterhouse Five
Miller, Death of a Saleman
Hemingway, The Sun Also Rises ; The Old Man and the Sea
Walker, Alice, The Third Life of Grange Copeland
Silkon, Marmon, Ceremony
Foucalt, Michael, This Is Not A Pipe
American Indian Mythology
Ellison, Ralph, The Invisible Man
Janeway, Elizabeth, Man's World, Woman's Place

Non-Western Humanities (substitute, as appropriate, for works listed above by period)

Near East and India:

Arberry, Arthur, The Koran Interpreted
Smith, Daniel, Selections from the Vedic Hymns
Warren, Henry, Buddhism in Translation
Davids, T.W. Rhys, Buddhist Suttas
Edgerton, Franklin, The Bhagavad Gita

China and Japan:

Lau, D.C. The Analects of Confucius
Keene, Donald, 20 Plays of the No Theatre
Henderson, H., An Introduction to Haiku

Jewish Thought:

Buber, Ten Rungs - Hasidic Sayings
Buber, Tales of the Hasidim: Later Masters

Reading List - Supplemental Texts

Altizer, History as Apocalypse , chapters on Augustine,

Dante and Milton
Barret, The Illusion of Technique , section on William James
Bird, Otto, Cultures in Conflict, sections on philosophy, poetry, and arts
Braudel, On History , section on the Mediterranean World
Campbell, Grammatical Man, sections on cybernetics, entropy and symbolism
Cassirer, The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms , sections on mythical form and totemism
Fleming, Arts and Idea, sections on the ancient world, the medieval period, and the Renaissance
Gombrich, Tributes, sections on Hegel and Freud
Haskins, The Rise of the Universities, section on the medieval student
Hubner, Critique of Scientific Reason , Part 3, The Scientific World and the Mythical World
Hofstadter, An Eternal Golden Braid
Kubler, George, Shape of Time, sections on the arts
Kuhn, George, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, section on progress through revolution
Snow, Two Cultures, Science and the Liberal Arts as opposing cultures